

REMARKS

Claim 29 has been amended to correct an obvious grammatical error. Claims 15 to 35 remain active in this application.

It is noted that claims 21 to 35 have not been rejected and it is therefore assumed that these claims have been allowed.

Claims 15 to 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yang et al. (U.S. 6,468,894. The rejection is again respectfully traversed for reasons presented in the prior response, which are incorporated herein by reference.

It is further noted that claim 15 requires “a buffer structure disposed upon the second metallic interconnect in proximity to the primary via structure and within the diffusion volume to buffer the primary via structure from diffusive voiding occurring at a contact point between the primary via structure and the second metallic interconnect”. The term “active diffusion volume” is stated to be defined by the simultaneous intersection of the interconnect volume, diffusion volume, and stress gradient region as a specific site within a device structure, hence it is the smallest overlapping portion of the three volumes surrounding a vulnerable SIV site (see page 17, first full paragraph). It is noted that the rejection is based upon 35 U.S.C. 102. Accordingly, it is imperative that the examiner clearly demonstrate that the claimed subject matter is found in Yang et al. Not only has this not been done, but, in addition, no such structure is found in Yang et al.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jay M. Cantor
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 19,906
(301) 424-0355 (Phone)
(972) 917-5293 (Phone)
(972) 917-4418 (Fax)